

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

CASE NO.:

CARLOS BRITO,

Plaintiff,

v.

J P RENTAL INVESTMENTS LLC;
and LATIN CAFE & MINI
MARKET INC.,

Defendants.

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, CARLOS BRITO, individually (hereinafter “Plaintiff”), sues J P RENTAL INVESTMENTS LLC and LATIN CAFE & MINI MARKET INC. (hereinafter collectively referred to herein as “Defendants”), and as grounds alleges:

JURISDICTION, PARTIES, AND VENUE

1. This is an action for injunctive relief, attorneys' fees, litigation expenses, and costs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181, *et seq.*, (the “Americans with Disabilities Act” or “ADA”).

2. The Court has original jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s claims arising under 42 U.S.C. § 12181, *et seq.* pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343 and 42 U.S.C. § 12117(a).

3. Plaintiff, CARLOS BRITO, is an individual over eighteen years of age, with a residence in Miami-Dade County, Florida, and is otherwise *sui juris*.

4. At all times material, Defendant, J P RENTAL INVESTMENTS LLC, owned and operated a commercial shopping plaza located at 1166 SW 17th Ave., Miami, FL 33135 (hereinafter collectively the “Commercial Property”) and conducted a substantial amount of business in that place of public accommodation in Miami-Dade County, Florida.

5. At all times material, Defendant, J P RENTAL INVESTMENTS LLC, was and is a Florida Limited Liability Company with its business headquarters in Miami-Dade County, Florida, with its agents and/or offices in Miami, Florida.

6. At all times material, Defendant, LATIN CAFE & MINI MARKET INC., owned and operated a commercial restaurant business located at 1166 SW 17th Ave., Miami, FL 33135 (hereinafter “LATIN CAFE & Mini Market”) and conducted a substantial amount of business in that place of public accommodation in Miami-Dade County, Florida. Defendant, LATIN CAFE & MINI MARKET INC., holds itself out to the public as “LATIN CAFE & Mini Market”.

7. At all times material, Defendant, LATIN CAFE & MINI MARKET, was and is a Florida Profit Corporation, incorporated under the laws of the State of Florida, with its principal address in Miami, FL.

8. Venue is properly located in the Southern District of Florida because Defendants’ Commercial Property, and/or businesses operated therein, is/are located in Miami-Dade County, Florida; Defendants regularly conduct business within Miami-Dade County, Florida; and because a substantial part(s) of the events or omissions giving rise to these claims occurred in Miami-Dade County, Florida.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

9. Although over thirty (30) years have passed since the effective date of Title III of the ADA, Defendants have yet to make their facilities accessible to individuals with disabilities.

10. Congress provided commercial businesses one and a half years to implement the Act. The effective date was January 26, 1992. In spite of this abundant lead-time and the extensive publicity the ADA has received since 1990, Defendants have continued to discriminate against

people who are disabled in ways that block them from access and use of Defendants' property and the businesses therein.

11. The ADA prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in 28 CFR 36.201 and requires landlords and tenants to be liable for compliance.

12. Plaintiff, CARLOS BRITO, is an individual with disabilities as defined by and pursuant to the ADA. Plaintiff, CARLOS BRITO, is, among other things, a paraplegic (paralyzed from his T-6 vertebrae down) and is therefore substantially limited in major life activities due to his impairment, including, but not limited to, not being able to walk or stand. Plaintiff requires the use of a wheelchair to ambulate.

13. The Plaintiff is a staunch advocate of the ADA. Since becoming aware of his rights, and their repeated infringement, he has dedicated his life to this cause so that he, and others like him, may have full and equal enjoyment of public accommodations without the fear of discrimination and repeated exposure to architectural barriers in violation of the ADA.

14. He is often frustrated and disheartened by the repetitiveness of the complaints he is forced to make to employees and management at different places of public accommodation over thirty (30) years after the legislation of the ADA, to no avail. The Plaintiff is accordingly of the belief that the only way to affect change is through the mechanisms provided under the ADA.

15. Defendant, J P RENTAL INVESTMENTS LLC, owns, operates, and oversees the Commercial Property, its general parking lot and parking spots specific to the businesses therein, and all common areas within the Commercial Property located in Miami Dade County, Florida, that is the subject of this Action.

16. The subject Commercial Property is open to the public. The individual Plaintiff

visits the Commercial Property and businesses located within the commercial property, to include a visit to the Commercial Property and business located within the Commercial Property on or about March 8, 2025, and encountered multiple violations of the ADA that directly affected his ability to use and enjoy the Commercial Property. He often visits the Commercial Property in order to avail himself of the goods and services offered there and is near other businesses and restaurants he frequents as a patron.

17. Plaintiff plans to return to the Commercial Property within three (3) months of the filing of this Complaint, in order to avail himself of the goods and services offered at the place of public accommodation and check if it has been remediated of the ADA violations he encountered.

18. The Plaintiff found the Commercial Property and the businesses named herein located within the Commercial Property to be rife with ADA violations. The Plaintiff encountered architectural barriers at the Commercial Property, and businesses named herein located within the Commercial Property, and wishes to continue his patronage and use of each of the premises.

19. The Plaintiff has encountered architectural barriers that are in violation of the ADA at the subject Commercial Property and businesses located within the Commercial Property. The barriers to access at the Commercial Property, and businesses within, have each denied or diminished Plaintiff's ability to visit the Commercial Property and have endangered his safety in violation of the ADA. The barriers to access, which are set forth below, have likewise posed a risk of injury(ies), embarrassment, and discomfort to Plaintiff, CARLOS BRITO, and others similarly situated.

20. Defendants, J P RENTAL INVESTMENTS LLC and LATIN CAFE & MINI MARKET INC., own and/or operate places of public accommodation as defined by the ADA and

the regulations implementing the ADA, 28 CFR 36.201 (a) and 36.104. Defendants, J P RENTAL INVESTMENTS LLC and LATIN CAFE & MINI MARKET INC., are each responsible for complying with the obligations of the ADA. The place of public accommodation where Defendants, J P RENTAL INVESTMENTS LLC and LATIN CAFE & MINI MARKET INC., own and/or operate are the Commercial Property and/or Business located at 1166 SW 17th Ave., Miami, FL 33135.

21. Defendants, J P RENTAL INVESTMENTS LLC and LATIN CAFE & MINI MARKET INC., are jointly liable and responsible for all the violations listed in Count II of this Complaint.

22. Defendant, J P RENTAL INVESTMENTS LLC, as landlord of the commercial property is liable for all the violations listed in this Complaint.

23. Plaintiff, CARLOS BRITO, has a realistic, credible, existing, and continuing threat of discrimination from the Defendants' non-compliance with the ADA with respect to the described Commercial Property, with respect to the allegations of this Complaint. Plaintiff has reasonable grounds to believe that he will continue to be subjected to discrimination at the Commercial Property, in violation of the ADA. Plaintiff desires to visit the Commercial Property and business located therein, not only to avail himself of the services available at the Commercial Property, but to assure himself that the Commercial Property and business therein are in compliance with the ADA, so that he and others similarly situated will have full and equal enjoyment of the Commercial Property without fear of discrimination.

24. Defendants have discriminated against the individual Plaintiff by denying him access to, and full and equal enjoyment of, the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages

and/or accommodations of the Commercial Property and business located therein, as prohibited by 42 U.S.C. § 12182 et seq.

COUNT I – ADA VIOLATIONS
AS TO DEFENDANT, J P RENTAL INVESTMENTS LLC

25. The Plaintiff adopts and re-alleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 24 above as though fully set forth herein.

26. Defendant, J P RENTAL INVESTMENTS LLC, has discriminated, and continues to discriminate against Plaintiff in violation of the ADA by failing, inter alia, to have accessible facilities by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). A list of the violations that Plaintiff encountered during his visit to the Commercial Property, include but are not limited to, the following:

A. Parking

- i. There are accessible parking spaces with signs that are mounted too low, violating Section 4.6.4 of the ADAAG and Section 502.6 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- ii. The Plaintiff had difficulty exiting the vehicle, as designated accessible parking spaces are located on an excessive slope. Violation: There is accessible parking spaces located on an excessive slope violating Section 4.6.3 of the ADAAG and Section 502.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iii. The Plaintiff had difficulty exiting the vehicle, as designated accessible parking space access aisles are located on an excessive slope. Violation: There are accessible parking space access aisles located on an excessive slope violating Section 4.6.3 of the ADAAG and Section 502.4

of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

B. Entrance Access and Path of Travel

- i. The Plaintiff had difficulty traversing the path of travel, as it was not continuous and accessible. Violation: There are inaccessible routes between sections of the facility. These are violations of the requirements in Sections 4.3.2(2), 4.3, and 4.5 of the ADAAG and Sections 206.2.2, 303, 402 and 403, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- ii. The Plaintiff had difficulty traversing the path of travel, as there are cross slopes in excess of 2%. Violation: The path of travel contains excessive cross slopes in violation of Section 4.3.7 of the ADAAG and Section 403.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iii. The Plaintiff had difficulty entering tenant spaces without assistance, as the entrance thresholds are too high. Violation: There are threshold rises more than ½ inch at the tenant entrances, violating Section 4.13.8 of the ADAAG and Section 404.2.5 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iv. The Plaintiff could not enter tenant spaces without assistance, as the required level landing is not provided. Violation: A level landing that is 60 inches minimum perpendicular to the doorway is not provided at accessible entrances violating Section 4.13.6 and Figure 25(a) of the ADAAG and Section 404.2.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

**COUNT II – ADA VIOLATIONS AS TO J P RENTAL INVESTMENTS LLC and
LATIN CAFE & MINI MARKET**

27. The Plaintiff adopts and re-alleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 24 above as though fully set forth herein.

28. Defendants, J P RENTAL INVESTMENTS LLC and LATIN CAFE & MINI MARKET INC., discriminated against, and continue to discriminate, against Plaintiff in violation of the ADA by failing, inter alia, to have accessible facilities by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). A list of the violations that Plaintiff encountered during his visit to the Commercial Property, includes but are not limited to, the following:

A. Public Restrooms

- i. There are permanently designated interior spaces without proper signage, violating Section 4.1.3(16) and 4.30 of the ADAAG and Sections 216.2 and 703 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- ii. The Plaintiff had difficulty entering the restroom without assistance, as the door threshold is too high. Violation: There are threshold rises in excess of ½ inch at the restroom entrances, violating Section 4.13.8 of the ADAAG and Section 404.2.5 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iii. The Plaintiff could not use the restroom without assistance, as the required clear floor space was not provided due to the dimensions. Violation: Compliant clear floor space is not provided in the restroom, violating Sections 4.2.3 and 4.22.3 of the ADAAG and Sections 304.3 and 603.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iv. The Plaintiff had difficulty using the doorknob and locking mechanism on the restroom door without assistance, as they require tight grasping. Violation: The restroom door has non-compliant hardware for disabled patrons, violating Sections 4.13.9 & 4.27.4 of the ADAAG and Sections 309.4 & 404.2.7 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily

achievable.

- v. The Plaintiff could not exit the restroom without assistance, as the required maneuvering clearance was not provided due to the location of a trashcan. Violation: The restroom door does not provide the required latch side clearance due to a lack of maintenance violating Section 4.13.6 of the ADAAG, 28 CFR 36.211, and Section 404.2.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- vi. The Plaintiff was exposed to a cutting/burning hazard because the lavatory pipes are not wrapped. Violation: The lavatory pipes are not fully wrapped or insulated violating Section 4.19.4 of the ADAAG and Section 606.5 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- vii. The Plaintiff could not use the mirror, as it is mounted too high. Violation: The mirrors provided in the restrooms are in violation of the requirements in Section 4.19.6 of the ADAAG and Section 603.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- viii. The Plaintiff could not flush the toilet without assistance, as the flush valve is not mounted on the wide area. Violation: The flush valve is not mounted on the compliant side in violation of Section 4.16.5 of the ADAAG and Section 604.6 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- ix. The Plaintiff could not transfer to the toilet without assistance, as the rear grab bar is missing and the side grab bar is not the required length. Violation: The grab bars do not comply with the requirements prescribed in Section 4.16.4 & Figure 29 of the ADAAG and Sections 604.5 & 609.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

- x. The Plaintiff could not use the paper towel dispenser without assistance, as it is mounted too high. Violation: There are dispensers provided for public use in the restroom, with controls outside the ranges prescribed in Sections 4.2.5, 4.2.6, and 4.27.3 of the ADAAG and Sections 308 & 309.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- xi. The Plaintiff could not use the restroom without assistance, as the required clear floor space was not provided. Violation: Compliant clear floor space is not provided due to the door swinging into the restroom, violating Sections 4.2.3, 4.22.2, and 4.22.3 of the ADAAG and Sections 304.3 and 603.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

RELIEF SOUGHT AND THE BASIS

29. Plaintiff requests an inspection of the Defendants' places of public accommodation in order to photograph and measure all of the discriminatory acts violating the ADA listed herein and barriers to access identified in this Complaint in conjunction with Rule 34 and timely notice. Plaintiff requests to be allowed to be physically present at such inspection in conjunction with Rule 34 and timely notice. Plaintiff requests the inspection in order to participate in crafting a remediation plan to address Plaintiff's request for injunctive relief. The remediations for the ADA violations listed herein are readily achievable.

30. The Plaintiff has been denied access to and has been denied full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities privileges, benefits, programs, and activities offered by Defendants, Defendants' buildings, business, and facilities; and has otherwise been discriminated against and damaged by the Defendants because of the Defendants' ADA violations as set forth above. The Plaintiff, and all others similarly situated, will continue to suffer such discrimination, injury and damage without the immediate relief provided by the ADA as requested

herein. Plaintiff requests the inspection in order to participate in crafting a remediation plan to address Plaintiff's request for injunctive relief.

31. Defendants have discriminated against the individual Plaintiff by denying him access to full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of its place of public accommodation or commercial facility, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12181 et seq. and 28 CFR 36.302 et seq. Furthermore, Defendants continue to discriminate against Plaintiff by failing to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford all offered goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations to individuals with disabilities; and by failing to take such efforts that may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services.

32. Plaintiff is without adequate remedy at law, will suffer irreparable harm, and has a clear legal right to the relief sought. Further, injunctive relief will serve the public interest and all those similarly situated to Plaintiff. Plaintiff has retained the undersigned counsel and is entitled to recover attorneys' fees, costs, and litigation expenses from Defendants pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205 and 28 CFR 36.505.

33. Defendants are required to remove the existing architectural barriers to the physically disabled when such removal is readily achievable for their place of public accommodation, the Plaintiff will continue to suffer such discrimination, injury and damage without the immediate relief provided by the ADA as requested herein.

34. Notice to Defendants is not required as a result of the Defendants' failure to cure

the violations by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). All other conditions precedent have been met by Plaintiff or waived by the Defendants.

35. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188, this Court is provided with authority to grant Plaintiff's Injunctive Relief, including an order to alter the property where Defendants operate their business, located at and/or within the commercial property(s) located 1166 SW 17th Ave., Miami, FL 33135, the interiors, exterior areas, and the common exterior areas of the Commercial Property, and businesses named as Defendants herein, to make those facilities readily accessible and useable to the Plaintiff and all other mobility-impaired persons; or by closing the facility until such time as the Defendants cure the violations of the ADA.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff, CARLOS BRITO, respectfully requests that this Honorable Court issue (i) injunctive relief against Defendants including an order to make all readily achievable alterations to the facilities; or to make such facilities readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities to the extent required by the ADA; and to require Defendants to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford all offered goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations to individuals with disabilities; (ii) an award of attorneys' fees, costs and litigation expenses pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; and (iii) such other relief as the Court deems just and proper, and/or is allowable under Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Dated: March 28, 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

GARCIA-MENOCAL, P.L.

Attorneys for Plaintiff

350 Sevilla Avenue, Suite 200

Coral Gables, FL 33134

Telephone: (305) 553-3464

Primary E-Mail: bvirues@lawgmp.com

Secondary E-Mails: aquezada@lawgmp.com

jacosta@lawgmp.com

By: /s/ Alfredo Garcia-Menocal
ALFREDO GARCIA-MENOCAL
Florida Bar No.: 533610

THE LAW OFFICE OF RAMON J. DIEGO, P.A.

Attorneys for Plaintiff

5001 SW 74th Court, Suite 103

Miami, FL, 33155

Telephone: (305) 350-3103

Primary E-Mail: rdiego@lawgmp.com

Secondary E-Mail: ramon@rjdiegolaw.com

By: /s/ Ramon J. Diego
RAMON J. DIEGO
Florida Bar No.: 689203